



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

DEC 02 2010

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP  
290 BROADHOLLOW ROAD  
SUITE 210E  
MELVILLE, NY 11747

PCT LEGAL ADMINISTRATION

In re Application of  
CHOI  
Serial No.: 10/575,593  
PCT App. No.: PCT/KR04/01191  
Int'l Filing Date: 19 May 2004  
Priority Date: 11 October 2003  
Attorney Docket No.: 1365-4PCT US  
For: VACUUM FIXER

DECISION ON  
PETITION UNDER  
37 CFR 1.181

This is a decision on applicant's "Request for Reconsideration of Petition to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure to Receive Office Action Under 37 CFR 1.181(a)", filed on 20 September 2010 in the US Patent and Trademark Office. No petition fee is required.

**BACKGROUND**

On 11 April 2006, applicant filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States which was accompanied by, *inter alia*, the basic national fee.

On 30 October 2006, the Office mailed a Notification of Acceptance under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/903).

On 05 February 2009, a Notification of Missing Requirements (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) was mailed to applicant indicating that an oath or declaration, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b), was required.

On 23 November 2009, the Office mailed a Notification of Abandonment (Form PCT/DO/EO/909) indicating, that the application went abandoned for failure to respond to the Notification of Missing Requirements mailed 05 February 2009.

On 30 December 2009, applicant filed a petition requesting that the Office withdraw the holding of abandonment because applicant did not receive the Notification of Missing Requirements.

On 13 August 2010, a decision dismissing the petition was mailed to applicant.

**DISCUSSION**

MPEP Section 711.03(c), Section I. A., "Petition to Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure to Receive Office Action" states in relevant part:

The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication

must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

The Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

Practitioner stated that the Notification of Missing Requirements was not received and that a search of the practitioner's records, including any file jacket or equivalent, revealed that the Notification of Missing Requirements was not received. The petition includes an adequate description of the firm's system for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record, establishing that the system is sufficiently reliable. Furthermore, the renewed petition includes a master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date two months from the mail date of the Notification of Missing Requirements. These copies are sufficient to show that applicant did not receive a copy of the Notification of Missing Requirements as set forth in MPEP 711.03(c)IA. Thus, applicant provided the proper showing necessary to withdraw the holding of abandonment as explained above and the petition is granted.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons above, Applicant's petition under 37 CFR 1.181 to request to withdraw holding of abandonment is **GRANTED**.

The Notification of Abandonment mailed on 23 November 2009 is hereby **VACATED**.

The application will be forwarded to the United States Designated/Elected Office for further processing. The 35 U.S.C. 371 (c)(1), (c)(2) and (c)(4) date is 30 December 2009.

/Cynthia M. Kratz/  
Cynthia M. Kratz  
Attorney Advisor  
PCT Legal Office  
Office of PCT Legal Administration  
Telephone:(571) 272-3286